

## TANGIBLE RESULT #4

# Deliver Transportation Solutions and Services of Great Value



MDOT will deliver transportation solutions on time and within budget. The Department will use strategies to ensure that the transportation solution meets the needs of customers and eliminates unnecessary costs.

### RESULT DRIVER:

Jason Ridgway

*State Highway Administration (SHA)*

# Deliver Transportation Solutions and Services of Great Value

## TANGIBLE RESULT DRIVER:

Jason Ridgway

*State Highway Administration (SHA)*

## PERFORMANCE MEASURE DRIVER:

Aviva Brown

*Motor Vehicle Administration (MVA)*

## PURPOSE OF MEASURE:

To gauge the accuracy of capital project estimates to manage the Department's capital program more efficiently.

## FREQUENCY:

Annually (In October)

## DATA COLLECTION METHODOLOGY:

Through the Capital Program Management System (CPMS); the CTP; TSO & TBU's procurement offices.

## NATIONAL BENCHMARK:

+/- 5 percent. This mirrors the benchmark as reported by Nebraska's Dept. of Roads, Fiscal Responsibility for the Accuracy of Project Estimates. While MDOT has not specified a benchmark per se, they use Nebraska's 5 percent as the bench for the best.

Note: This benchmark applies to capital construction projects. So far and with extensive research, we have been unable to find a benchmark for IT projects.

## PERFORMANCE MEASURE 4.1

### Percent of Estimated Project Budget as Compared to Final Project Award

This performance measure fosters more accuracy and better budget management of the State's limited transportation funding. Accurate estimating enables MDOT to provide better services to its customers, whether it is infrastructure improvements to State roadways and bridges; increasing and retaining the commerce going in and out of the Port of Baltimore; attracting and retaining airlines and travelers at BWI Marshall; providing more alternative service options to Maryland citizens to conduct their MVA transactions remotely; or improving transit services throughout the State.

Given the diverse differences between construction and IT projects, we have separated into two categories with specific budget parameters:

- \$1M+ construction type projects: SHA, MDTA, MPA, MAA and MTA
- \$400K+ IT projects: TSO and MVA

For FY's 2015, 2016, and 2017, the range in percent change between the estimated project budgets and the final project awards was from 1.46 percent to 7.23 percent. While the range is within the +/- 5 percent, the goal is to continue working on strategies to obtain the +/- 5 percent consistently.

To improve the outcomes of this measure, MDOT is engaged in the following activities:


- Team expansion with subject matter experts (SME's) from each TBU;
- Use of estimating tool;
- Creation of excel spreadsheet to ensure consistency in gathering data for PM 4.1 – PM 4.3; and
- Modified dataset for construction contracts to \$1M (MAA, SHA, MDTA, MPA and MTA).

# Deliver Transportation Solutions and Services of Great Value

## PERFORMANCE MEASURE 4.1

### Percent of Estimated Project Budget as Compared to Final Project Award

Chart 4.1.1: Percent of Estimated Project Budget as Compared to Final Project Award FY2018




# Deliver Transportation Solutions and Services of Great Value

## PERFORMANCE MEASURE 4.1

### Percent of Estimated Project Budget as Compared to Final Project Award

Chart 4.1.2: Percent of Estimated Project Budget as Compared to Final Project Award TSO and MVA FY2018



# Deliver Transportation Solutions and Services of Great Value

## **TANGIBLE RESULT DRIVER:**

Jason Ridgway

*State Highway Administration (SHA)*

## **PERFORMANCE MEASURE DRIVER:**

Brian Miller

*Maryland Port Administration (MPA)*

## **PURPOSE OF MEASURE:**

To measure the difference in the contract amount from NTP to final contractor payout.

## **FREQUENCY:**

Annually (in October)

## **DATA COLLECTION METHODOLOGY:**

Collect data from MDOT TBUs for FY2014 to FY2018. Data will reflect contracts that closed out in each respective fiscal year. Data will be reflected in a bar graph for each fiscal year.

## **NATIONAL BENCHMARK:**

2 percent

## **PERFORMANCE MEASURE 4.2**

### Percent of Change for Finalized Contracts

It is important to assess how well we manage the budgeted and awarded amount during the duration of Department contracts. This is done to ensure we are getting what we paid for and not adding unnecessary or unbudgeted costs to our transportation projects. This will facilitate better contract performance and better management of contracts which will add overall value to the project and ensure worthwhile expenditures of taxpayer dollars.

Strategy development meetings have been held with TBU representatives throughout the reporting year to review data and address any issues that exist to meet the 2 percent benchmark for compliance. Data for FY2018 illustrates a collective effort for benchmark compliance by TBU. Only one TBU; MAA was over the 2 percent benchmark with a higher margin at 4.64 percent. This was due to changes in the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) and Customs and Border Protection (CBP) security requirements that affected two contracts that were already underway. Changes to the contracts had to be undertaken to facilitate the new security requirements. MDTA was over the 2 percent benchmark by .66 percent due to a site condition change in one of their contracts.

Individual TBUs may not have data from a fiscal year if no contract(s) closed during the respective fiscal year.

# Deliver Transportation Solutions and Services of Great Value

## PERFORMANCE MEASURE 4.2

### Percent of Change for Finalized Contracts

Chart 4.2.1: Percent Change for Finalized Contracts by TBU FY2015





Chart 4.2.2: Percent Change for Finalized Contracts by TBU FY2016





# Deliver Transportation Solutions and Services of Great Value

## PERFORMANCE MEASURE 4.2

### Percent of Change for Finalized Contracts

Chart 4.2.3: Percent Change for Finalized Contracts by TBU FY2017





Chart 4.2.4: Percent Change for Finalized Contracts by TBU FY2018



# Deliver Transportation Solutions and Services of Great Value

## **TANGIBLE RESULT DRIVER:**

Jason Ridgway

*State Highway Administration (SHA)*

## **PERFORMANCE MEASURE DRIVER:**

Bill Appold

*The Secretary's Office (TSO)*

## **PURPOSE OF MEASURE:**

To determine if MDOT is efficiently managing and delivering contracts and services.

## **FREQUENCY:**

Annually (in October)

## **DATA COLLECTION METHODOLOGY:**

Information will be provided by the MDOT Offices of Construction, Planning and Finance.

## **NATIONAL BENCHMARK:**

87 percent

## **PERFORMANCE MEASURE 4.3**

### On-time Services and Solutions: Percent of Projects Completed by Original Contract Date

When MDOT awards a contract or agrees to provide a service, it establishes a commitment date which is the date the contract or service begins providing benefits to MDOT's stakeholders.

The purpose of this performance measure is to track MDOT's accuracy in estimating if contracts and services are completed and open to service by the commitment date specified in the contract. The performance measure will also determine if there are common factors that make contracts go over their budgeted time and whether these factors can be mitigated.

Overall MDOT increased the percentage of contracts completed in a timely basis from 60 percent in FY2016 and 71 percent in FY2017 to a FY2018 total of 75 percent. This is largely due to a new standard that measures project completion based on when our stakeholders start receiving "beneficial use" from the project. This aligns with MDOT's focus on its customers.


Another reason for the improved performance is the adoption of strategies designed to limit delays in the completion of contracts. These strategies include the implementation of A + B Bidding and Time of Year Letting strategies as well as a lessons learned process post-completion and a having design changes undergo administrator review and approval.



## PERFORMANCE MEASURE 4.3

### On-time Services and Solutions: Percent of Projects Completed by Original Contract Date

Chart 4.3.1: On-Time Services and Solutions, Percent of Projects Completed by Original Contract Date FY2016-FY2018



# Deliver Transportation Solutions and Services of Great Value

## TANGIBLE RESULT DRIVER:

Jason Ridgway

*State Highway Administration (SHA)*

## PERFORMANCE MEASURE DRIVER:

Ross Turlington

*Maryland Transit Administration (MTA)*

Jim Harkness

*Maryland Transportation Authority (MDTA)*

Shawn Ames

*Maryland Aviation Administration (MAA)*

## PURPOSE OF MEASURE:

To track the average cost of common transportation services and solutions to make decisions as to where to reduce costs as appropriate.

## FREQUENCY:

Annually (in January and July)

## DATA COLLECTION METHODOLOGY:

Through the Capital Program Management System (CPMS); CTP and MDOT Capital Budget, Finance and Procurement Offices.

## NATIONAL BENCHMARK:

N/A

## PERFORMANCE MEASURE 4.4

### Average Cost of Common Transportation Solutions and Services

It is MDOT's responsibility to provide transportation solutions and services to the public that are of great value.

The purpose of these measures is to track, access, and analyze data that will help reveal solutions for reducing the cost of transportation services. Tracking data that is grouped by shared services across business units will allow comparison across TBUs, and also insight into ways to reduce the cost of services to the public.

Performance measure 4.4 has 10 separate measurements. These measurements include minor and major road resurfacing cost, interstate road resurfacing cost, bridge replacement cost and major bridge redecking cost. Other measurements include operating cost per passenger trip, operating cost per revenue vehicle mile, passenger trips per revenue vehicle mile, farebox recovery and cost per transaction.


Tracking of these measures is based upon actual costs associated with contracts issued for various road and bridge projects. Because data for these projects is tracked annually, in any given year there may not be an award for this type of project as can be seen from some of the MDTA data.

Regardless, the data will provide our customers with insights into how Maryland transportation projects compare to national averages. Benchmarks are sought to gauge how Maryland solutions and services compare with national averages as well as who is considered the best in this category. Based on year-to-year data comparisons, the goal is to identify ways to reduce costs to the citizens of Maryland.

## PERFORMANCE MEASURE 4.4A

### Average Cost of Common Transportation Solutions and Services

Chart 4.4A: Minor Road Preservation Life Cycle Cost FY2014-FY2017




# Deliver Transportation Solutions and Services of Great Value

## PERFORMANCE MEASURE 4.4B

### Average Cost of Common Transportation Solutions and Services

Chart 4.4B: Major Road Preservation Life Cycle Cost FY2014-FY2017




# Deliver Transportation Solutions and Services of Great Value

## PERFORMANCE MEASURE 4.4C

### Average Cost of Common Transportation Solutions and Services

Chart 4.4C: Interstate Preservation Life Cycle Cost FY2014-FY2017



# Deliver Transportation Solutions and Services of Great Value

## PERFORMANCE MEASURE 4.4D AND E

### Average Cost of Common Transportation Solutions and Services

Chart 4.4D: Average Bridge Replacement Cost FY2015-FY2018




Chart 4.4E: Average Bridge Redecking Cost FY2015-FY2018






# Deliver Transportation Solutions and Services of Great Value

## PERFORMANCE MEASURE 4.4F

### Average Cost of Common Transportation Solutions: Operating Cost per Passenger Trip (MTA)

Operating cost per passenger trip is calculated by dividing modal passenger trips by the total modal operating expenses. All MTA modes experienced an increase in Cost per Passenger Trip. The rise in cost for Metro, Light Rail, and Bus is related to a decrease in ridership coupled with an annual increase in operating cost. MTA purchased transportation modes of MARC, Commuter Bus and Mobility service experienced increases in ridership during FY2018, but contract escalators increased the operational costs offsetting potential decreases in cost per passenger trip. All data is based on National Transit Database (NTD) figures.

**Chart 4.4F.1: Operating Cost Per Revenue Vehicle Mile FY2013-FY2018**




# Deliver Transportation Solutions and Services of Great Value

## PERFORMANCE MEASURE 4.4G

### Average Cost of Common Transportation Solutions: Operating Cost per Revenue Vehicle Mile (MTA)

Operating cost per revenue vehicle mile is calculated by dividing modal vehicle revenue miles by the total modal operating expenses. Metro, Light Rail, Mobility, MARC, Commuter Bus and Taxi Access all saw an increase in Cost Per Revenue Mile. The increases in cost for MDOT MTA's directly operated modes is due to modal expense increases year over year and a reduction in specific modal revenue vehicle miles due to service interruption events. The cost increases for our purchased transportation modes increased due to contract escalators. All data is based on National Transit Database (NTD) figures.

**Chart 4.4G.1: Operating Cost Per Passenger Trip FY2013-FY2018**




# Deliver Transportation Solutions and Services of Great Value

## PERFORMANCE MEASURE 4.4H

### Average Cost of Common Transportation Solutions: Passenger Trip per Revenue Vehicle Mile (MTA)

Passenger trips per revenue vehicle mile is calculated by dividing modal passenger trips by the total modal revenue vehicle miles. Bus, Light Rail and Metro's Passenger Trips per Revenue Vehicle Miles decreased due to lower ridership in FY2018. MARC and Commuter Bus experienced an FY2018 increases in due to higher modal ridership. All data is based on National Transit Database (NTD) figures.

**Chart 4.4H.1: Passenger Trips Per Revenue Vehicle Mile FY2013-FY2018**




# Deliver Transportation Solutions and Services of Great Value

## PERFORMANCE MEASURE 4.4I

### Average Cost of Common Transportation Solutions: Farebox Recovery Ratio (MTA)

Farebox Recovery Ratio is calculated by dividing total modal expenses by the fares recuperated by the modes. MDOT MTA directly operated modes of Bus, Light Rail and Metro's Farebox Recovery Ratio decreased in FY2018 due to declines in ridership. MDOT MTA purchased transportation farebox recovery also decreased slightly due to rises in operations costs despite gains in ridership. All data is based on National Transit Database (NTD) figures.

Chart 4.4I.1: Farebox Recovery Ratio FY2013-FY2018





# Deliver Transportation Solutions and Services of Great Value

## PERFORMANCE MEASURE 4.4J

### Average Cost of Common Transportation Solutions: Cost per Transaction (MVA)

The cost per transaction includes those costs that directly affect an MVA product. It is based on the operating expense, compared to the total number of customer transactions completed by visiting one of the MVA locations, mailing in a request, or completing a transaction through an alternative service delivery. The operating expense is inclusive of salaries, overtime and wages, and all other expenses related to completing a customer transaction. Operating expense does not include the administrative costs, costs for IT system enhancements, and onetime start-up costs for new product development. Also, not included are costs for MHSO and Capital Programs.

In FY2018 there was a decrease in cost per transaction when compared to FY2017. This decrease is mostly due to an overall reduction in transactions as well as a reduction in operating expenditures. Although the overall trend for branch transactions is expected to decrease with an increase in ASD. There is an anticipated spike in branch transaction expected for FY2019 which could increase the cost per transaction in the next fiscal year. Trends in cost per transaction can vary with policy changes, new legislation and new technologies which allow customers to complete more transactions online and through kiosks.

Branch facilities will continue to drive the cost per transaction calculation. The MVA has been collaborating with other state agencies to utilize MVA locations to offer more opportunities for Maryland customers. Recently, MVA has made modifications to some of the branch offices to offer services for DNR, EZPass, Charm Cards, Vital Records, TWIC Card and TSA precheck. MVA staff provide support to the TWIC and TSA pre-check counters. As this scenario continues, MVA will be able to quantify the percentage of other State agencies utilizing MVA branches, and this will affect the MVA cost per transaction.

# Deliver Transportation Solutions and Services of Great Value

## PERFORMANCE MEASURE 4.4J

### Average Cost of Common Transportation Solutions: Cost per Transaction (MVA)

Chart 4.4J.1: MVA Operating & Administrative Cost Per Transaction FY2015-FY2018

